GHA Trees
5 South Drive
High Wycombe
Bucks
HP13 6JU

Glen Harding MICFor
MSc (Forestry), MArborA
t: 07884 056025
e: info@ghatrees.co.uk
www.ghatrees.co.uk

# Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report: Denville Hall, 62 Ducks Hill Road, Middlesex, HA6 2SB

2nd November 2022

Ref: GHA/DS/122660:22

**CONTENTS**

# Arboricultural Report

Location: Denville Hall, 62 Ducks Hill Road, Middlesex, HA6 2SB
Ref: GHA/DS/122660:22
Client: Denville Hall
Date: 2nd November 2022
Prepared by: Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
Date of Inspection: 23rd June 2021

**Instructions**

**Issued by – Denville Hall**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to Denville Hall, in order to assess their general condition and to provide a planning integration statement for the indicative proposed development that safeguards the long term well being of the retained trees in a sustainable manner.**



**Executive Summary**

The proposal for the site is to renovate and extend the existing buildings to improve and expand the existing facilities. The site access will be realigned to improve site entrance and egress. The proposed scheme requires the removal of a number of trees and shrubs, however the development presents an excellent opportunity to plant some new trees, to enhance the site and local area for the future. The retained trees require protection in accordance with industry best practice and BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations, in order to ensure their longevity.

## Documents Supplied

The client supplied the following documents:

1. Topographical survey
2. Existing layout plans
3. Proposed layout plans

## Scope of Survey

1.1 The survey is concerned with the arboricultural aspects of the site only.

1.2 The planning status of the subject property was not investigated in detail.

1.3 A qualified Arboriculturist undertook the report and site visit and the contents of this report are based on this. Whilst reference may be made to built structure or soils, these are only opinions and confirmation should be obtained from a qualified expert as required.

1.4 Trees in third party ownership were surveyed from within the subject property, therefore a detailed assessment was not possible and some (if not all) measurements were estimated. Where the stem location of a third party tree has been estimated, this is noted on the plan.

1.5 Dense vegetation or climbers (such as ivy) also prohibited full inspections for some trees; this is noted where applicable.

1.6 No discussions took place between the surveyor and any other party.

1.7 The trees were inspected on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method expounded by Mattheck and Breleor (The body language of tree, DoE booklet Research for Amenity Trees No. 4, 1994)

1.8 The survey was undertaken in accord with British Standard 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.

1.9 Tree works will be required to be in accord with British Standard 3998 – 2010 (Tree Work - Recommendations).

1.10 Underground services near to trees will need to be installed in accord with the guidance given in BS5837 together with the National Joint Utilities Group Booklet 4: 2007 Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility services in proximity to trees (NJUG4).

1.11 The client's attention is drawn to the responsibilities under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

## Survey Method

2.1 The survey was conducted from ground level with the aid of binoculars if needed.

2.2 No tissue samples were taken nor was any internal investigation of the subject trees undertaken.

2.3 No soil samples were taken.

2.4 The height of each subject tree was estimated using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre.

2.5 The stem diameter for each tree was measured in line with the requirements set out in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.

2.6 The crown spreads were measured with an electronic distometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where the crown radius was notably different in any direction this has been noted on the Plan (appendix A) and within the tree table (Appendix B). The crowns of those trees that are proposed for removal, or trees where the crown spread is deemed insignificant in relation to the proposed development are not always shown on the appended plan; however their stem locations are marked for reference.

2.7 The Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree is included in the tree table, both as an area, and as the radius of a circle.

2.8 The crown clearance was measured using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where it is significantly lower in one direction, this is noted within the tree table at appendix B.

2.9 All of the trees that were inspected during the site visit are detailed on the plan at Appendix A; this plan was produced in colour and **MUST** only be scanned or reproduced in colour. The trees on this plan are categorised and shown in the following format:

COLOUR CODING AND RATING OF TREES:

Category A – Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. Colour = light green crown outline on plan.

Category B – Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. Colour = mid blue crown outline on plan.

Category C – Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 to 20 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. Colour = uncoloured crown outline on plan.

Category U – Those in such a condition that they cannot realisitically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. Colour = red crown outline on plan.

All references to tree rating are made in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations', Table 1.

## The Site

3.1 The site is located on Ducks Hill Road, a through road located to the east of Northwood.

3.2 Access to the property is currently gained via a driveway to the front (east) of the site.

## The Subject Trees

4.1 The details of the subject trees are set out in the Schedule at Appendix B.

**4.2 Please be aware that ash tree(s) were identified during the survey. Many ash trees in the UK are suffering from 'ash dieback' (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus)* which can cause the rapid decline of affected trees, often rendering them unsafe. Affected trees have been highlighted in the tree table at appendix B and the severity of the infection noted; however please ensure these trees are inspected regularly.**

4.3 Of the seventy individual trees, and groups of trees surveyed, three have been assessed as BS 5837 category A, eighteen three have been assessed as BS category B, forty five have been assessed as BS category C with the remaining three trees being assessed as BS 5837 category U.

| | |
|---|---|
| Category A | 4 trees |
| Category B | 18 trees |
| Category C | 1 trees |
| Category U | 3 trees |

## The Proposal

5.1 The proposal for the site is to renovate and extend the existing buildings to improve and expand the existing facilities.

5.2 The site access will be realigned to improve site entrance and egress.

5.3 The proposed location of the above structures can be seen on the appended plan.

## Arboricultural Impact Assessment

PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL / RETENTION:

6.1 The following trees are proposed for removal as part of the new development, as these specimens could not be effectively retained as they are located within the outline of the new structures, or located too close to make their retention feasible / sustainable.

G2, G5, G6, G7, G8, T4, T5, T6, T8, T9, T10, T11, T26, T27, T28, T30, T31, T33, T34, T35, T36, T37, T38, T39, T42, T43, T44, T45, T47, T48, T49, T50, T51 and T61

6.2 The assessed grading (as per BS5837 table 1) of each of the trees to be removed, as well as any relevant comments on their condition can be seen in the tree table at appendix B.

TREE PRUNING TO ACCOMODATE THE PROPOSAL OR ACCESS TO THE SITE

6.3 T32 will be pruned to improve clearances from the proposed new structure. A full specification for the proposed pruning can be seen in the tree table at appendix B.

6.4 The implementation of the proposal does not lead to the requirement to prune any of the other retained trees, or shrubs.

ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

6.5 Section 4.6.3 of BS 5837: 2012 states that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of each tree should be assessed by an arboriculturalist considering the likely morphology and disposition of the roots, when known to be influenced by past or existing site conditions. The assessed RPAs can be seen on the appended plan.

ASSESSED IMPACT ON RPAS BY PROPOSED STRUCTURES

6.6 New structures (including the new walkway) and some small sections of new buildings are located within the RPAs of retained trees as shown on the appended plan. To minimise the requirement for excavations near these trees the use of specialised footings will be adopted. In order to arrive at a suitable foundation design (which minimises root disturbance within the RPAs of nearby retained trees), site specific and specialist advice regarding footings should be sought from an Engineer, in close discussion with the projects Arboriculturalist.

6.7 Where sections of the new driveway / parking are within the RPAs of trees to be retained, an "up and over" style construction will be necessary, to ensure that all existing ground levels are retained in their current form, as well as ensuring that satisfactory moisture and oxygen can be obtained from the underlying soil by any tree roots in this area. A design for this proposed access route must be drawn up by a structural engineer, in close co-ordination with the retained arboriculturalist.

6.8 All new pathways and soft landscaping areas within the Root Protection Areas (RPA's) of the retained trees should be designed using no-dig, up and over

construction and in close co-ordination with the retained Arboriculturalist using porous materials.

INSTALLATION OF SERVICES

6.9 The installation of underground apparatus and drainage systems with the use of mechanical excavators will undoubtedly sever any roots that may be present and can change the hydrology and structure of the nearby soil in a way that will adversely affect the health of any nearby trees. Particular care should therefore be taken when assessing the layout of new services and consideration **MUST** be given to the methods of installation of **ALL** underground apparatus.

6.10 New services should be routed to avoid all RPAs of retained trees on site and within nearby sites. From an assessment of the subject site, undertaken in conjunction with the project architect, there is no reason to assume this isn't possible. Inspection chambers must also be sited outside the RPAs of any nearby trees.

## Post Development Pressure

FUTURE TREE AND STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS

7.1 The retained trees are at a satisfactory distance from the proposed new buildings, and highly unlikely to give rise to any inconvenience.

7.2 Some minor lateral pruning of the retained trees and shrubs may be required in the medium term; however, any such work would not have a significant impact on the health or amenity value of these trees.

7.3 Regular inspections of the retained trees by a suitably qualified Arboriculturalist and subsequent remedial works will ensure that the trees are maintained in a suitable manner, to exist in harmony with the new structures and its occupants for many years to come.

## Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works

8.1 TREE PRUNING / REMOVAL

A list of all tree works that are required (including trees to be removed) is included in the tree table at Appendix B. Where any tree work is needed, this work **MUST** be in accordance with British Standard 3998 – 2010 (Tree Work - Recommendations).

8.2 TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS

It is essential for the future health of the trees to be retained on site, that all development activity is undertaken outside the root protection zone of these trees. The position of the fence **MUST** be marked out with biodegradable marker

paint on site and agreed with appropriate representatives from the LPA and contractor. The fencing **MUST** be erected **prior** to any works in the vicinity of the trees and removed only when all development activity is complete. The protective fencing **MUST** be as that shown in BS 5837 (see Appendix C). The herras panels **MUST** be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers which **MUST** be installed so they can only be removed from the inside of the fence. The panels **MUST** supported by stabilizer struts, which **MUST** be installed on the inside and secured to the ground using pins or appropriate weights.

The Fence must be marked with a clear sign reading:
**"Construction Exclusion Zone – No Access"**

8.3 BOUNDARY TREATMENTS

Boundary fencing installation / upgrades **MUST** be undertaken as part of the soft landscaping phase and **MUST** be installed ONLY when all machinery that is on site for the main build has permanently left the site (NB. If needed, boundary fencing can also be installed prior to the commencement of site works, i.e.. before any machinery has been bought onto the site). Where sections of new / upgraded fencing are located within the RPA of ANY tree that is to be retained, this work **MUST** be undertaken by hand using hand tools only. The locations of the new fence upright posts will be finalised following trial digs to confirm there are no major (over 25mm) roots present; if any such roots are found, the location must be altered. If any smaller roots are found, these can be cut using sharp hand sharp tools to leave a 'clean' cut, in order to minimise the risk of infection by decay pathogens. The post holes within the RPAs should then be lined with plastic sheeting before any concrete or cement is placed into the hole, in order that there is no risk of leaching into the nearby soil as the mixture dries.

8.4 SITE HUTS, WELFARE FACILITIES AND STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS AND CHEMICALS

All site huts **MUST** be positioned outside of the retained trees RPA's.

8.5 INCOMING SERVICES, DRAINAGE AND SOAKAWAYS

New services **MUST** be routed to avoid all RPAs of retained trees on site and within nearby sites. From an assessment of the subject site, undertaken in conjunction with the project architect, there is no reason to assume this isn't possible. Inspection chambers **MUST** be sited outside the RPA.

8.6 ON SITE SUPERVISION

Regular site supervision is essential to ensure all potentially damaging activities near to trees are correctly supervised. A pre start meeting will occur to ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities relating to tree protection on site; this will include a site induction for key personnel.

8.7 OTHER TREE PROTECTION PRECAUTIONS

- **NO** fires lit on site within 20 metres of any tree to be retained.
- **NO** fuels, oils or substances with will be damaging to the tree shall be spilled or poured on site.
- **NO** storage of any materials within the root protections zone.

8.8 TREE PLANTING

Some proposed locations for new trees can be seen on the landscape architect's plans. Tree planting should be undertaken between the months of November and

March by a suitably experienced contractor. The scheme should include the implementation of an aftercare package to include: weed management, tree hydration, stake and tie maintenance, replacement of any failures, mulching and formative pruning.

8.9 DISMANTLING PROTECTIVE BARRIERS
Protective barriers must only be completely removed when all machinery, and equipment has left site.

## Conclusion

9.1 Subject to precautionary measures as detailed above, the proposal will not be injurious to trees to be retained.

9.2 New trees and shrubs can be planted following approval from the Local Planning Authority to ensure a sustainable tree stock for the future.

## Recommendations

10.1 Site supervision – An individual e.g. the Site Agent, must be nominated to be responsible for all arboricultural matters on site. This person must:

a. Be present on the site the majority of the time.
b. Be aware of the arboricultural responsibilities.
c. Have the authority to stop any work that is, or has the potential to cause harm to any tree.
d. Be responsible for ensuring that all site personnel are aware of their responsibilities towards trees on site and the consequences of the failure to observe those responsibilities.
e. Make immediate contact with the local authority and / or retained arboriculturalist in the event of any related tree problems occurring whether actual or potential.

10.2 It is recommended, that to ensure a commitment from all parties to the healthy retention of the trees, that details are passed by the architect or agent to any contractors working on site, so that the practical aspects of the above precautions are included in their method statements, and financial provision made for these.

2nd November 2022
Signed:

Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
For and on behalf of GHA Trees

# Appendix A
# TREE PLAN
# (see separate PDF)

# Appendix B
# TREE TABLE

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T1 | Monterey pine | 20 | 1250 | 1 | 15.00 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 40+ | A2 | |
| T2 | Indian bean tree | 10 | 317 | 1 | 3.80 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | Suppressed tree of poor form. |
| T3 | Yew | 10 | 410 | 4 | 4.92 | 4 | 4 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 2 | 20-40 | B1 | |
| T4 | Ash | 9 | 124 | 1 | 1.49 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T5 | Ash | 9 | 110 | 1 | 1.32 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T6 | Ash | 9 | 124 | 1 | 1.49 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T7 | Cherry | 19 | 400 | 1 | 4.80 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 over site | 10-20 | C1 | |
| T8 | Ash | 22 | 450 | 1 | 5.40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T9 | Ash | 20 | 550 | 1 | 6.60 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T10 | Ash | 20 | 680 | 1 | 8.16 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T11 | Ash | 20 | 640 | 1 | 7.68 | 7 | 6.5 | 7 | 6.5 | 2 over site | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T12 | Sycamore | 12 | 147 | 1 | 1.76 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T13 | Sycamore | 12 | 260 | 1 | 3.12 | 5 | 2 | 5.5 | 6 | 3 | 10-20 | C1 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T14 | Elder | 5 | 201 | 5 | 2.41 | 2 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C1 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T15 | Silver birch | 13 | 151 | 1 | 1.81 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T16 | Silver birch | 13 | 201 | 1 | 2.41 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 1 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T17 | Silver birch | 11 | 165 | 1 | 1.98 | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T18 | Tulip | 11 | 155 | 1 | 1.86 | 2.5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 20-40 | B1 | Future potential. |
| T19 | Rowan | 11 | 94 | 1 | 1.13 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1 | 10-20 | C1 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T20 | Cockspur thorn | 6 | 100 | 1 | 1.20 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T21 | Oak | 6 | 100 | 1 | 1.20 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T22 | Blackthorn | 4.5 | 127 | 2 | 1.53 | 1.5 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 0 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T23 | Chestnut | 4.5 | 100 | 1 | 1.20 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T24 | Spring cherry | 2 | 92 | 1 | 1.10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T25 | Paper birch | 10 | 170 | 1 | 2.04 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.5 | 3 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. |
| T26 | Paper birch | 10 | 190 | 1 | 2.28 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T27 | Paper birch | 10 | 165 | 1 | 1.98 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T28 | Norway maple | 4 | 120 | 1 | 1.44 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T29 | Sweetgum | 15 | 370 | 1 | 4.44 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 40+ | A1 | |
| T30 | Ash | 17 | 470 | 1 | 5.64 | 5 | 5.5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 20-40 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T31 | Ash | 15 | 400 | 1 | 4.80 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 20-40 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T32 | Oak | 17 | 780 | 1 | 9.36 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2.5 | 40+ | A1 | Recommend: prune laterally by 3m on east side of crown. |
| T33 | Hawthorn | 8 | 485 | 1 | 5.82 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | Less than 10 | U | 50% dead. Recommend: to be removed. |

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T34 | Elder | 6 | 270 | 1 | 3.24 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | Less than 10 | U | Declining crown. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T35 | Japanese cherry | 8 | 117 | 1 | 1.40 | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 1 | 2.5 | 10-20 | C1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T36 | Japanese cherry | 6 | 102 | 1 | 1.22 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T37 | Japanese cherry | 7 | 108 | 1 | 1.30 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T38 | Himalayan birch | 10 | 160 | 1 | 1.92 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T39 | Ash | 18 | 849 | 2 | 10.18 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Poor fork at base. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T40 | Wellingtonia | 30 | 1250 | 1 | 15.00 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 20-40 | B1 | |
| T41 | Wellingtonia | 25 | 1250 | 1 | 15.00 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 40+ | A1 | |
| T42 | Purple leaf plum | 6 | 424 | 2 | 5.09 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T43 | Ash | 7 | 120 | 1 | 1.44 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T44 | Ash | 9 | 140 | 1 | 1.68 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T45 | Norway maple | 8 | 150 | 1 | 1.80 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 20-40 | B1 | Future potential. Recommend: to be removed. |
| T46 | Indian bean tree | 10 | 600 | 1 | 7.20 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 40+ | B1 | |
| T47 | Sycamore | 14 | 580 | 1 | 6.96 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 20-40 | B1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T48 | Sycamore | 18 | 560 | 1 | 6.72 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 20-40 | B1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T49 | Sycamore | 18 | 570 | 1 | 6.84 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 20-40 | B1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T50 | Lawson cypress | 12 | 424 | 2 | 5.09 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | Less than 10 | U | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T51 | Sycamore | 16 | 268 | 5 | 3.22 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 20-40 | B1 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| T52 | Privet | 7 | 520 | 3 | 6.24 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 10-20 | C1 | |
| T53 | Rowan | 5 | 120 | 1 | 1.44 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | Previously lost top at 2m. |
| T54 | Holly | 4 | 142 | 1 | 1.70 | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 20-40 | B1 | |
| T55 | Horse chestnut | 12 | 575 | 1 | 6.90 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 20-40 | B2 | |
| T56 | Sycamore | 12 | 520 | 1 | 6.24 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 20-40 | B2 | |
| T57 | Sycamore | 13 | 970 | 3 | 11.64 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 20-40 | B2 | |
| T58 | Sycamore | 12 | 500 | 1 | 6.00 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 20-40 | B2 | |
| G1 | Ash | 16 | 260 | 1 | 3.12 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 | 10-20 | C2 | Early signs of Ash dieback noted. |
| G2 | Beech | 2 | 70 | 1 | 0.84 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| G3 | Beech | 2 | 80 | 1 | 0.96 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10-20 | C2 | |

| Tree Number | Tree Name (species) | Ht (m) | Calculated Stem Diameter (mm) | Number of Stems | Root Protection Area (Radius, m) | N (m) | E (m) | S (m) | W (m) | Clearance (m) | Estimated life expectancy | BS Category | Comments / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G4 | Lawson cypress | 8 | 200 | 1 | 2.40 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10-20 | C2 | |
| G5 | Lawson cypress | 11 | 300 | 1 | 3.60 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| G6 | Mixed species | 10 | 300 | 1 | 3.60 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| G7 | mixed species | 6 | 170 | 2 | 2.04 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| G8 | Mixed species | 12 | 300 | 1 | 3.60 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 10-20 | C2 | Recommend: to be removed. |
| G9 | Mixed species | 10 | 300 | 1 | 3.60 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 10-20 | C2 | |
| T59 | Oak | 18 | 350 | 1 | 4.20 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 over site | 20-40 | B1 | Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated. |
| T60 | Fir | 18 | 400 | 1 | 4.80 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 20-40 | B1 | Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated. |
| T61 | Leyland cypress | 18 | 600 | 1 | 7.20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 10-20 | C1 | No notable defects recorded during inspection. Recommend: to be removed. |

KEY :

Tree No: (T= individual tree, G= group of trees, W= woodland)

Age class: Young (Y), Middle aged (MA), Mature (M), Over mature (OM), Veteran (V)

Height (Ht): Measured in metres +/- 1m

# Appendix C
# TREE FENCING DETAIL

Figure 3 **Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems**